in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

#### Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–29237 Filed 10–30–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Atlantic City Electric Company, Baltimore Gas & Electronic Company, Delmarva Power & Light Company, GPU Service Corporation, PECO Energy Company, Potomac Electric Power Company, PP&L, Inc., Public Service Electric & Gas Company

[Docket Nos. ER97–3189–001, ER97–3189–002, ER97–3189–003, ER97–3189–004, ER97–3189–005, ER97–3189–006, ER97–3189–007, ER97–3189–008 (Not Consolidated)]

### Notice Deferring Implementation of Settlements and Extension of the Time for Making Refunds

October 27, 1998.

On October 9, 1998, PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM) filed a motion requesting that the Commission defer the implementation of the settlements filed, or to be filed, in the above-docketed proceedings. PJM's motion also requested that the Commission extend the time for PJM to make refunds and file its compliance reports until such time as the Commission has acted upon all of the aforementioned settlements.

In its motion, PJM requests that the Commission defer implementation of all the settlements filed, or to be filed, in the above-captioned proceedings in order to avoid PJM making piecemeal recalculations of system-wide rates and multiple refunds. PJM further states that implementing the settlements individually would require PJM to engage in a complex, time-consuming refund process, whereas a single recalculation of the rates and a single refund computation upon approval of all of the settlements is more practical and far less burdensome. The motion also states that PJM's customers would not be prejudiced by deferring implementation of the settlement rates and refunds because PJM will be refunding any over-collections with interest to the date of the refunds,

regardless of the date that the refunds are made.

Upon consideration, notice is hereby given that an extension of time for the implementation of the rates, terms, and conditions of all offers of settlement approved in the Letter Orders dated September 18, 1998 in *Baltimore Gas & Electric Company*, Docket No. ER97–3189–002, *Potomac Electric Power Company*, Docket No. ER97–3189–006, and *Public Service Electric & Gas Company*, Docket No. ER97–3189–008, is granted until such time as the Commission has acted upon all of the settlements in these proceedings.

An extension of time within which PJM must make refunds in Docket Nos. ER97–3189–002, ER97–3189–006 and ER97–3189–008 is granted to and including 90 days from the date of approval of all of the settlements. PJM shall file the necessary compliance reports 30 days thereafter. Finally, PJM shall file the requisite tariff sheets reflecting the settlement rates 30 days after the date of approval of all of the settlements.

The extensions of time granted herein apply only to the three proceedings in which the Commission has already issued Letter Orders, discussed above.

#### David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–29272 Filed 10–30–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP99-27-000]

## Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

October 27, 1998.

Take notice that on October 20, 1998, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 12801 Fair Lakes Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22030-0146, filed in Docket No. CP99-27-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.212) seeking Natural Gas Act Section 7 certification for an existing point of delivery to Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc., (COH) in Harrison County, Ohio, under Columbia's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-76-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Columbia requests certification of an existing point of delivery which was originally authorized under Section 311 of the Natural Gas Policy Act for transportation service to COH. Columbia states that COH has requested approximately 5,500 Dth/Day under Columbia's Interruptible Transportation Service (ITS) Rate Schedule. Columbia also states that the existing point of delivery is being utilized to serve a new coal processing plant.

Columbia states that it constructed the existing point of delivery to COH and placed it in service on June 1, 1998. Columbia also states that interconnecting facilities installed by Columbia included a 6-inch tap and meter, filter separator and electronic measurement. Columbia states the existing point of delivery is being utilized for industrial service to serve a new coal processing plant. Columbia states the cost of constructing the point of delivery was \$19,100.

Columbia states that it has complied with all of the environmental requirements of Section 157.206(d) of the Commission's Regulations during the construction of the existing point of delivery.

Columbia states that it anticipates that the services to be provided through the interconnection will be provided on an interruptible basis and therefore, no impact is expected on Columbia's existing design day and annual obligations to its customers as a result of the establishment of the new point of delivery.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

#### Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–29235 Filed 10–30–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M